APPENDIX 3



Neil Edmunds & Jackie Mullard 30 Park Road Fordingbridge Hants SP6 1EQ

Claire Upton-Brown Executive Head of Planning, Regeneration and Economy New Forest District Council Appletree Court Beaulieu Road Lyndhurst Hants SO53 7PA

Your Ref TPO/0012/21

17th October 2021

Dear Ms Upton-Brown

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO: TPO/0012/21

We wish to object in the strongest terms relating to the above Tree Preservation Order.

The plane tree in question was planted by our landscaper in late 2014. The garden we took over in 2012 at 30 Park Road was unkempt and disorderly with a retaining boundary wall onto Park Road which was tipping over toward the pavement. It had a broken tarmac and mud drive and was generally a mess.

The garden has been landscaped and replanted professionally and the failing retaining boundary wall has been rebuilt. The driveway has been scraped and properly finished.

However the plane tree in question planted at that time (late 2014) has exceeded any height and width expectations we had.

We are amazed that a tree that has only been in situ for less than 7 years can be considered a public amenity and be subject to a TPO.

There has never been a nest in this tree even though we used encouraging means for the birds. We have plenty of other greenery and shrubs in our garden that can provide habitat for wildlife. Indeed we had a nest in a bay tree this year that stands less than 5ft tall.

We are very supportive of adding greenery (trees and shrubs) to our environment but with the knowledge we now have that such a young tree may become subject to a TPO will affect future thinking on our planting.

The plane tree was planted to provide some summer privacy but is now too large for its site and is already overhanging the road.

Please reconsider this decision - We would again stress that a tree cannot be classed as a public amenity when it has only been there for less than 7 years in our own private garden.

The more people we speak to about this are amazed this can happen. It is the public's view that a TPO would apply to attractive trees of great age and not a privately planted tree of such a young age.

We are being penalized because we paid more and bought a larger tree in 2014 for instant privacy.

We look forward to your decision which can now be based on further information provided in this letter and hope for the TPO removal.

Yours sincerely

. .



Neil Edmunds & Jackie Mullard